

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIFICATION

Paragraph [0029] of the present application has been amended to correct a topographical error. Specifically, the word “ration” on line 9 is replaced with the word “ratio” as originally intended.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4, 8-15, 19-25, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman (U.S. Publication 2002/0135696; hereinafter “Perlman”) in view of Shigeta (U.S. Publication 2002/0089518; hereinafter “Shigeta”). Claims 7, 18, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Shigeta and further in view of Naegle (U.S. Publication 2004/0012577; hereinafter “Naegle”).

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 12, and 23 have been amended to further distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph 29 and original claims 4, 15, and 24 of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references, either individually or in combination, does not disclose at least the following limitation recited in the amended independent claims (actual languages may vary slightly between the independent claims):

a configurable frame rate conversion unit configured to synchronize each converted data stream to an output frame rate, wherein the output frame rate is selectively locked to any of the input video data stream clock rates or a ratio of the input video data stream clock rates, and not a display clock rate.

The outstanding office action indicates that Perlman discloses the above-recited limitation in Figs. 3a and 3b, because “the frame is locked to either the interlaced or non-interlaced clock rate.” (See outstanding office action, page 5, section 8.) However, with Perlman, the interlaced or non-interlaced clock rate is the clock rate of the *display*, not the clock rate of any of the *input* video streams or a *ratio* of the clock rates of the *input* video streams.

Paragraphs [0024]-[0028] of Perlman describe Figs. 3a and 3b. For example, in the system “initially determines whether *the display* on which the multimedia content is to be rendered is interlaced or non-interlaced.” (See Perlman, paragraph [0024]; emphasis added.) Based on whether the display is interlaced or non-interlaced, the source content is transformed to fit the *display* resolution and/or scaling factors. (See Perlman, paragraph [0025].) Again in paragraphs [0027]-[0028], Perlman describes adjusting the source content based on the characteristics of the display.

Similarly, Shigeta describes converting the format of each of the image signals in terms of resolution and frame frequency based on the attributes of the image *display apparatus* 200 described in the EDID. (See Shigeta, paragraphs [0090], [0125], [0164], and [0186].) And nowhere in Naegle describes synchronizing the frame rate to a selected input clock rate or a ratio of the input clock rates.

Thus, non of the cited references describes converting the input video data streams based on the *display* attributes, not on the *clock rates of any of the input streams or a ratio of the input video data stream clock rates*.

In contrast, amended independent claims recite that the output frame rate is selectively synchronized any of the *input* video data stream clock rates or a *ratio* of the *input* video data stream clock rates. For above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims are patentbly distinct from the cited references.

Dependent claims 4, 15, and 24 have been cancelled. Dependent claims 2-3, 8-10, 13-14, 18-22, 25, and 29-34 directly or indirectly depend from claims 1, 12, and 23 respectively and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Further, these dependent claims recite additional limitations that when considered in the context of the claimed invention further patentably distinguish the art of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in proper form and are in condition for allowance, and request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. It is believed that no fee is due at this time. Should any fee be required for any reason related to this document, however, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 500388, referencing Docket No. GENSP052. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below with any questions or concerns relating to this document or application.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Bernadette Lee/
Bernadette J. Lee
Reg. No.: 60,298

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001